PATENT Attorney Docket No. 450100-3922.2

U.S. Appln. No. 10/081,615 Reply to Office Action dated August 10, 2010

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully

requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into

condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the

application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 25-42 are currently pending. Claims 25, 30, 35, and 26, which are

independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the

Specification, specifically at page 15, lines 10-25.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims

are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103,

or \$112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of

protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such

citations are provided mcrely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the

claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, non-limiting exemplary support of the amendment can be found

at page 15, lines 10-25 of the Specification, which is reproduced as follows:

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 212-588-0800

Customer No. 20999

Page 12 of 15 00814169.DOC

Page 15, lines 10-25, The interface boc 25 converts the received command into an infrared signal acceptable for the type of each electronic device, and transmits it to the VTR11, FM tuner 12, MD player/recorder 13, TV receiver 14, and audio amplifier 15 of the audio/visual system 5. Thus, the respective devices are set in desired modes of operation.

For example, when the title 32A in Fig. 2 is clicked, the command [07H, 0AH, 08H] attached to the title is received at the interface box 25. The interface box 25 converts the command into an infrared signal equivalent to the G code "142" for VTR 11, and transmits the infrared signal to VTR11. As a results, VTR 11 is set for "142" or the G code system.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 25-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,552,833 to Henmi, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Henmi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,204,662 to Oda et al. (hereinafter, merely "Oda") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,787,259 to Haroun, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Haroun") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,089 to Murray (hereinafter, merely "Murray").

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 25 recites, inter alia:

...interfacing means for determining code information assigned to an individual program and corresponding to the text based control commands, generating an infrared signal

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 212-588-0800 Customer No. 20999

PATENT Attorney Docket No. 450100-3922.2

U.S. Appln. No. 10/081,615 Reply to Office Action dated August 10, 2010

equivalent to the code information, and transmitting the infrared signal to the recording module. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that Henmi, Oda, Haroun, Kuwamoto, and Murray,

taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or disclose the above-identified features of

claim 25. Specifically, nothing is found that teaches or discloses "interfacing means for

determining code information assigned to an individual program and corresponding to the

text based control commands, generating an infrared signal equivalent to the code

information, and transmitting the infrared signal to the recording module," as recited in

claim 25.

Therefore, claim 25 is patentable.

Claims 30, 35, and 36, which recite similar feature with that of claim 25, are also

patentable for similar reasons.

As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified

deficiencies, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the

independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same

reasons. As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action curcs the above-identified

deficiencies, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

As each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however,

the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully

requested.

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151

212-588-0800 Customer No. 20999

Page 14 of 15 00814169.DOC

PATEN1 Attorney Docket No. 450100-3922.2

U.S. Appln. No. 10/081,615 Reply to Office Action dated August 10, 2010

CONCLUSION

Similarly, because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least

the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on

each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken

as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address

such comments.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the

claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to

issue of the present application,

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any

overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

Attorneys for Applicant

Thomas F. Presson

Reg. No. 41,442 (212) 588-0800

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 212-588-0800

Customer No 20999

Page 15 of 15

00814169.DOC